DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 910 EA 021 669

AUTHOR Gottfredson, Denise C.
TITLE Promising Strategies for Improving Student Behavior.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 40p.; Paper prepared for the Conference on Student Discipline Strategies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Washington, DC, November 6-7, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Cooperation; *Discipline Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Intervention; *Student Behavior; Theory Practice Relationship; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland (Baltimore)

ABSTRACT

In response to growing public concern over declining educational quality and discipline problems in today's schools, this paper reviews research on the causes of school disruption and student misbehavior, identifies promising ameliorative strategies, and examines specific research-practitioner collaborations that have successfully reduced school disorder. Schools with discipline problems lack fair, clearly stated, and firmly enforced rules and respond ambiguously to student misbehavior or ignore it. Such schools are large, located in urban areas, lack teaching resources and close teacher-administrator cooperation, and have teachers with punitive attitudes. Disruptive students generally do not attend school regularly, are low achievers with low educational expectations, have delinquent friends, dislike school, lack belief in the validity of rules, and have little adult supervision. The risk factors for schools and individuals converge in suggesting the need for clear, fair, and consistent rule enforcement that promotes a more positive attitude toward school and the validity of rules. Bringing about beneficial school change requires an organizational development approach, as used in a national Delinquency Prevention Through Alternative Education project using a tool called Program Development Evaluation. The Effective Schools Project in Baltimore, Maryland, is an example of a successful collaborative process working toward classroom management and instructional innovations aimed at improving student outcomes. (Unfortunately, the improvement was never institutionalized.) Other specific program models and instructional strategies are summarized, along with recommendations for further research. (40 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Final
EA

ED315910

Promising Strategies for Improving Student Behavior

Denise C. Gottfredson

Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology

University of Maryland

November, 1986

Prepared for presentation at OERI's Conference on Student Discipline Strategies, November 6 - 7, 1986. The research reported in this paper was funded by the National Institute of Education and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and was performed at the Center for Social Organization of Schools at the Johns Hopkins University. The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Gary Gottfredson, Lois Hybl, Oliver Moles, and Amy Schwartz in the preparation of this manuscript.

EA 021 669

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Promising Strategies for Improving Student Behavior

The public lacks confidence in our nation's public schools. Gallup polls show that the public perception of the quality of public schools is declining: The percentage giving the schools an "A" rating declined from 18% to 6% between 1974 and 1983 (Gallup, 1974, 1984). A series of reports--notably the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), Boyer (1983), Cusick (1983), and Sizer (1984)--has documented what has been called a "rising tide of mediocrity" in schools, and surveys show that lack of discipline tops the list of problems adults see facing schools (Bahner, 1980).

This paper reviews research on the causes of school disruption and student misbehavior, identifies promising strategies for reducing these problems, and provides examples of researcher-practitioner collaborations that have succeeded at reducing school disorder.

Risk Factors for School Disruption and Disruptive Behavior

What contributes to school disruption? An analysis of data for over 600 schools (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1985) showed that schools with discipline problems are:

1. Schools where the rules are not clear, fair, and firmly enforced;

2. Schools that use ambiguous responses to student behavior--by lowering grades in response to misconduct, for example;

3. Schools where teachers and administrators do not know what the rules are or agree on responses to student misconduct;

4. Schools that ignore misconduct;

5. Schools where students do not believe in the rules;

6. Large schools;

7. Schools that lack resources needed for teaching;

8. Schools with poor teacher-administration cooperation or with inactive administrations; and

9. Schools where teachers tend to have punitive attitudes.

The research also showed that the problem of school disorder is greatest in urban settings. Schools located in urban communities characterized by poverty and disorganization are far more likely to experience high levels of disorder than are schools in other communities. Community disorganization level and the location of the school in an urban area account for more than half of the variation in junior high schools' levels of disorder, and these variables make independent contributions to disorder above and beyond the contributions of level of community crime, school staffing, size, resources, school governance and educational climate, and measures of student socialization and school performance (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1985, chapter 10). I mention these community factors not to imply that changes to

school and classroom organization will not be effective at reducing disorder, but to remind us of the reality that the powerful influence of these socioeconomic factors places limitations on our potential for reducing school disorder without making more fundamental changes to the social and economic organization of our cities.

The research demonstrates that there is much schools can do to reduce disorder. The factors influencing disorder listed above are factors that make independent contributions to school disorder. Adding characteristics that place schools at high risk for disorder those characteristics that place individual students at high risk for engaging in disruptive behavior helps focus our attention on a set of specific risk factors for disorder. These risk factors suggest specific, research-based strategies for reducing disorder. Research (Empey, 1982; G. Gottfredson, 1981; Hirschi, 1969) has demonstrated that disruptive students are students who

1. Do not attend school regularly;
2. Do not perform well in school;
3. Have low educational expectations;
4. Have delinquent friends;
5. Dislike school;
6. Lack belief in the validity of rules; and
7. Have little adult supervision.

The risk factors for schools and individuals converge in suggesting the need for clear, fair, and consistent rule enforcement that is implemented in a way that promotes liking for school and belief in the validity of the rules among delinquency-prone youths. The research suggests the need for educational strategies that promote academic success among low achievers and that motivate these youths to attend school on a more regular basis. The research suggests the need for strategies that encourage attachments to prosocial others--both teachers and peers. And the research suggests the need to strengthen schools as organizations--to increase communication, consensus, and cohesion.

The following sections summarize work that has translated these research findings into practice. A description of an organizational development approach to implementing change in schools is followed by a summary of results of attempts to test specific research-based strategies aimed at reducing disorder.

Organizational Change in Schools

The last decade has taught us important lessons about the process of creating beneficial change in schools. Attempts to "install" effective practices identified by research have been far less successful than expected. These attempts have usually

resulted in incomplete, inadequate, or sporadic implementation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Cook, 1983; Grant & Capell, 1983; Hall & Loucks, 1977; Johnson, Bird & Little, 1979; Sarason, 1971). Indeed, Sarason (1971) has characterized many educational innovations as "nonevents" and Miles (1981) has described innovations as "ornaments" when goals and success criteria are vague.

Studies on improvement efforts have provided insight into schools' failures to effectively adopt effective practices. This research was summarized in Corcoran (1985). Some characteristics of school improvement efforts that have impeded innovation are the assumptions that technological advances can be transported from school to school and district to district with little or no alteration to fit each environment and that effective implementation of new practices can result from "one-shot" training sessions. Teachers are often expected to return to their schools and implement new ideas or practices with little or no support. Unclear school missions, reward structures, and role definitions also impede effective implementation. For example, teachers may be rewarded for maintaining order in their classrooms, even when the increase in orderliness is gained at the expense of limiting opportunities for learning.

Yet another source of implementation failure is the top-down approach to decision making and planning that fails to seek the advice of the primary implementers of the new practices in designing the intervention. This practice generally results in flawed program plans and alienated staff.

Bringing about beneficial change in schools requires an organizational development (OD) approach to school change. This kind of approach focuses attention on the school as an organization--it examines the organizational culture and climate and it seeks to improve the systems and procedures used by the organization. It usually focuses on improving communication, building trust and cooperation, enhancing the organization's problem-solving and decision-making capabilities, and strengthening its planning processes.

An OD approach was used for development, implementation, and evaluation of school-based delinquency programs in 69 schools. These schools were part of a national initiative, Delinquency Prevention Through Alternative Education, funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention between 1980 and 1983 (OJJDP, 1980).

The program evaluators for the initiative created an organizational development tool called Program Development

Evaluation (PDE) (G. Gottfredson, 1984; Gottfredson, Rickert, Gottfredson & Advani, 1984). PDE is intended to help schools and other organizations define problems and set organizational goals, specify theories of action on which to base the school improvement program, define measurable objectives based on the theory, select interventions with a high likelihood of achieving these objectives, identify and plan to overcome the obstacles to the implementation of the interventions selected, and develop detailed implementation standards to serve as blueprints for the interventions. Using the method, educators and researchers work together to evaluate their programs and use the resulting information to further improve the program. Planning and program development become part of the everyday routine in the school, creating a spiral of improvement.

The PDE method makes the following assumptions about organizational change:

1. Projects guided by explicit theories that can be translated into action will be most effective.
2. Projects will be implemented with most enthusiasm, be strongest, and contribute most to knowledge of school improvement if the theory on which the project is based is regarded as sensible by project implementers and accords with evidence from previous research and evaluation.
3. Effective implementation of an intervention or innovation is more likely if blueprints for the intervention are available and if implementation is guided by data about the extent to which project activities accord with the blueprint.

4. Effective adoption of an innovation is more likely when explicit plans for adoption are available and when these plans are likely to overcome obstacles to organizational change.

5. Projects will become more effective in the presence of "evaluation pressure." Evaluation pressure takes many forms, some of which are pressure to focus on theory, and to heed relevant information from previous research and evaluation and from current data about program strength, fidelity and effectiveness.

6. Organizations that internalize these principles will be more effective than those that simply comply with them (G.Gottfredson,1984; pp. 1101-1102).

The method translates each of the above assumptions into concrete steps that school personnel can take to increase the likelihood of strong implementation and effective adoption of new practices. The method is rational. It assumes that the effectiveness of organizations will increase as rational behavior increases. It recognizes that schools often work as loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1982) using ad hoc management methods, but it assumes that loose coupling often inhibits school effectiveness. The PDE method attempts to tighten management by developing explicit standards for performance, communicating these standards, assessing compliance or noncompliance with the standards, and adjusting interventions when necessary.

This method was used in the School Action Effectiveness Study (Gottfredson, 1982; Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Cook, 1983; Gottfredson, 1986b), the evaluation of OJJDP's alternative

education initiative, and in two other school improvement projects--the Effective Schools Project (Gottfredson, 1986c), and the School Enhancement Project (Abee, 1984). These studies yielded knowledge about the effect of specific strategies aimed at reducing disorder as well as about how specific strategies can be effectively implemented in schools. In the following section I will describe the Effective Schools Project in detail because it provides a "worst case" example of what it takes to implement change in the schools that most desperately need to change--demoralized urban public schools.

The Effective Schools Project

Two junior high schools were selected by central administrators of the Baltimore City Public School system to collaborate with researchers at the Johns Hopkins University to improve their schools using the PDE method. The schools were selected because they (a) had experienced considerable disorder in the recent past, (b) were believed to be in need of help, (c) were expected to be receptive to the project, and (d) were expected to remain stable in terms of their student, teacher, and administrator populations for the three-year period beginning in Fall, 1982.

One of the two schools never implemented a strong program. The original principal, who did not support the program, was replaced at the beginning of the second year along with two of the three assistant principals. The new administrative staff did not fully support the program. Attempts to build commitment to the project failed, and although some minor changes in the school were implemented, the staff never fully backed the program. Readers interested in what was implemented in the school and in a more detailed account of the obstacles to implementation should refer to Gottfredson (1986c). This report concluded that organizational development methods will not work without administrative backing. The remainder of this report focuses on the second school, in which attempts to plan, implement, and evaluate strategies to reduce disorder were successful.

First, a word about the community context. Gottfredson (1986d) showed community characteristics taken from census data. The school is located in an impoverished inner-city neighborhood. The school district is predominantly minority; and it has a high percentage of female-headed households, persons in low status occupations, and families below the poverty level. The community falls well below the national average on these measures of socioeconomic status, placing the school at especially high risk for school disorder.

Measures of the school environment and the behavior and attitudes of teachers and students in the school taken during the first year of the project (a planning year) indicated severe problems: Teachers regarded the school as unsafe and their classrooms as disorderly. They reported that they were victimized frequently, were dissatisfied with their jobs, and that morale was low. They also had a low opinion of the effectiveness of the school administration. Students' reports of school safety were also below average, and a scale measuring the level of punitive action taken against students indicated that the school was characterized by extremely high levels of punishment. This picture of poor discipline in the school is corroborated by disciplinary removal records showing that, during the three years prior to the intervention, an average of 39% of the students were suspended from school each year in response to disciplinary infractions. Many students were sent home more than once, so that for every 100 students in the school, 72 were removed in the average year. The school assessment also showed that students felt more alienated, did not frequently receive rewards or recognition for their work in school, felt that they were treated disrespectfully by the school staff, and engaged in somewhat more delinquent activities than typical school children in similar schools.

The Improvement Process

The principal, after being oriented to the program, selected a school improvement team composed of teachers, a guidance counselor, administrators, a social worker, a school psychologist and a parent liaison worker. The team was oriented to the project and trained in the PDE method, and spent the 1982-83 school year planning for implementation the following Fall.

The planning included specification of program goals, consideration and prioritization of major sources of the schools' problems, and specification of program objectives directed at the primary sources of the problems. Measures were developed for every goal and objective and surveys were designed to assess progress towards these goals and objectives. The planning team administered surveys to all teachers and students in their school to obtain baseline information and to provide information for refining program plans. It also developed plans for program components targeted at each objective, oriented the entire school staff, and generated considerable staff enthusiasm for the project.

Eight program components were developed as part of project "CARE," and standards for both the intensity and fidelity of the components were established. During the two intervention years

that followed, these standards were monitored on an ongoing basis using various sources of information about implementation including teacher logs, teacher observations, interviews with school staff, questionnaires completed by school staff, and reports of program implementers. The school improvement team met formally once a month to review the status of each component and modify plans to strengthen the program.

The following paragraphs describe the two strongest program components. These components received the most attention from the implementers throughout the implementation period and were implemented with the most integrity.

Classroom management innovations. Two classroom management techniques--Assertive Discipline (Canter & Canter, 1976) and Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1969)--were used. The techniques are intended to promote a calm, orderly classroom atmosphere.

Assertive Discipline teaches teachers to (a) set clear, consistent limits and specify consequences for students; (b) provide uniform follow-through; and (c) offer students warmth, support and rewards for appropriate behavior.

Reality Therapy also stresses clear rules and consistent application of consequences, but it places more emphasis on

getting the student to make a commitment to change his or her behavior. Structured classroom meetings encourage students to present their views on a topic without fear of being ridiculed by other students or the teacher. The meetings are designed to promote positive interactions in the classroom and to increase attachments to others. They are also expected to promote introspection about values and attitudes.

All participating teachers were trained to use both techniques. Implementation surveys and observations implied that by the end of the second year, 73 and 79 percent, respectively, of the trained teachers were using the Reality Therapy and Assertive Discipline techniques. The average teacher held classroom meetings with three different classes, and held between two and three meetings with each class each semester. This translated into an average of seven meetings per student in the last semester.

The CARE staff emphasized positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior in their implementation of Assertive Discipline. Rewards were given to the classes with the best and the most improved attendance and behavior, and the winning classes were announced and displayed on a prominent bulletin board. The nine most troublesome classes were targeted for an intensive positive reinforcement program. The nineteen teachers

involved received training in basic principles and specific strategies of positive reinforcement. They were told that rewards should always be contingent on the students' behavior, that students must always be aware of exactly how they could earn rewards, and that tokens should be coupled with social reinforcers such as teacher praise. The teachers developed positive reinforcement plans that specified which behaviors would be rewarded, how frequently, and with how many tokens. They awarded points throughout each week according to their plan and recorded the points won on a chart visible to the students. Tokens were dispensed weekly and students were able to redeem them for food treats, school supplies, admission into a game room, and special events including parties and trips.

Teachers implemented the Assertive Discipline techniques with considerable fidelity. A technical report for the project (Gottfredson, 1986c) showed that the frequency of traditional responses to misbehavior (sending the student to the office and detention) declined, and the use of alternative responses (parent conferences, removal of privileges and behavior contracts) increased. The most striking improvement was in the use of positive reinforcements. The percentage of teachers reporting that they usually used awards, special privileges, material rewards and positive notification of parents increased by between

15 and 25 percent (depending on the particular positive response).

Classroom instructional innovation. Student Team Learning (STL; Slavin, 1980) techniques were used to change the classroom climate from a social to an academic one and to increase student motivation to master academic material. The STL techniques provide incentives for students to learn academic material by establishing competitions for team reward or recognition. Teams are composed of four or five students of differing ability. The team members study together and coach one another in preparation for class-wide tournaments or individual tests. Points are awarded to teams on the basis of their members' improvement over their own past performance or on the basis of their performance in a tournament in which students compete against individuals of similar ability levels.

Teacher observations and logs implied that STL was implemented with considerable strength and fidelity. All participating teachers were trained, and 78 percent tried at least one of the STL methods. About one-third of the trained teachers tried more than one of the methods. By the end of the second year, 58 percent of the teachers were using the technique consistently, i.e., for at least six lessons during the semester. This level of implementation is much higher than the typical

level of implementation achieved when training is provided but no organizational development assistance is given. STL trainers report that only about 10 percent of the teachers they train actually adopt the method (John Hollifield, personal communication). Observation data confirmed that the techniques were implemented as recommended in the STL manual for the most part.

Other interventions. Other partially-implemented interventions included an intervention designed to inform the students' parents about classroom behavior frequently and consistently, a parent volunteer program designed to increase involvement of parents in school activities, a community support program designed to increase community support and advocacy for the school, and an extracurricular activities program directed at increasing students' attachment to school, sense of school pride, and the extent to which they were rewarded for nonacademic talents. A school discipline review and revision component succeeded in establishing a standard set of school rules, consequences for breaking school rules, and a disciplinary referral system to be used by all school staff members. And a career exploration intervention took students on career-related field trips, provided instruction on career-related topics, and exposed students to positive community role models who

volunteered to inform students about the skills required to obtain and perform jobs in their fields.

Outcomes

The data and methods used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project were described in detail in Gottfredson (1986c). Briefly, data from school records on attendance and disciplinary responses and teacher and student survey measures of organizational health, school disorder, and student attitudes and experiences targeted by the program were used to measure change over the three-year project period. The surveys were based on the Effective School Battery (G. Gottfredson, 1985) but supplemented with items necessary to assess all goals and objectives. Change in the school that successfully implemented a program was compared to change in the school which did not. Also, the school planning team's decision to pilot most innovations in one "unit" of the school, allowed comparisons of outcomes for students in the experimental unit with measures of comparable students from the previous cohort. That is, the experimental eighth graders' 1984-85 school year data were compared to the previous eighth grade cohort's 1983-84 school year data.

The intervention school improved dramatically on measures of organizational health. Teacher Morale rose from the 7th percentile on the ESB norms to the 40th percentile ($p < .01$), teacher reports of innovation rose from the 38th to the 63rd ($p < .05$), and teachers' perceptions of the school administration rose from the 3rd to the 31st percentile ($p <. 01$). Two of the three measures of disorder (classroom orderliness and student delinquent behavior) showed significant improvement, and these positive outcomes were accompanied by significant increases in students' sense of belonging in the school ($p < .01$) and in their reports of rewards in school ($p < .01$). School discipline records showed that fewer students were suspended for disciplinary infractions over the course of the project.(1)

The comparison of the experimental and nonexperimental cohorts yielded similar results. On all measures taken from the student survey, the experimental students answered more often in the desired direction. Significant differences were found in areas directly targeted by the program: Student sense of belonging ($p < .01$), and their reports of rewards ($p < .01$).

---

(1)Measures of administrative response to misconduct are at best ambiguous measures of student behavior. Measures of disciplinary removals are included here to show that increases in school orderliness measured more directly by reports of students and teachers did not come about simply by removing more troublesome students from school.

Other nonsignificant differences between the two cohorts favored the treatment: Experimental students were less rebellious ($p = .18$), more attached to school ($p = .11$), and reported more positive peer associations ($p = .20$).

Measures of disciplinary action taken against students revealed that experimental students were referred to the office much more frequently than were nonexperimental students. This increase in referrals to the office was due to the increased pressure for consistent rule enforcement in the experimental unit. The increase in office referrals was not accompanied by an increase in the more serious responses involving removal from school. Instead, the experimental students were suspended significantly less often than the prior cohort. This decline in suspensions could not be attributed to the program implemented in the experimental unit because suspensions declined school-wide in the 1984-85 school year. These results based on measures of <u>responses</u> to student behavior illustrate the danger of interpreting results based on such measures as if they measured student <u>behavior</u>. Measures of administrative response are highly sensitive to changes in policies and practices and do not adequately measure student behavior.

Conclusion

Some combination of innovations implemented in this Baltimore City junior high school--including changing the school and classroom environment to increase predictability in the responses of teachers and administrators to disciplinary infractions, increasing rewards for appropriate behavior, and increasing prosocial peer and teacher support--can increase students' sense of belonging in school and reduce disruptive behavior. Although it is not clear which interventions were most instrumental in producing the desired outcome, the results accord with the results of a recent study (Hawkins, Doueck, & Lishner, 1985) that showed that a combination of cooperative learning and "proactive classroom management" interventions resulted in increasing low-achieving students' attachment to school.

The process of bringing about these improvements is an essential piece of the picture. Many schools do not have the capacity for self-renewal. They must learn it. This process of organizational development takes time and persistence. Fullan, Miles and Taylor (1980) indicated that successful organizational development efforts in schools could be expected to take at least three years, and Klausmeier (1985) found that even after five years some schools were not able to sustain their own improvement process. The treatment school in the Baltimore City Project was

beginning to see some results after three years, but post-intervention communication with school personnel indicated that the school did not maintain those improvements. The improvements were not maintained because the school staff (and even the school improvement team that was directly responsible for implementing the program) had not internalized the principles underlying their efforts to promote school change. They complied with the OD methods as long as the researcher-facilitators maintained the process; they were even enthusiastic about their efforts. But they never took sole responsibility and they never believed that they could overcome their disabling conditions on their own.

Despite the failure to institutionalize the improvement process, the modest improvements reported here demonstrate the potential of an organizational development approach in schools to bring about positive change even in the most disadvantaged and demoralized schools.

Specific Program Models

Increasing Clarity and Consistency of Rule Enforcement

The remaining pages will summarize evidence about the efficacy of specific strategies for reducing school disorder. They will demonstrate that strategies based on the risk factors

identified by prior research and summarized earlier in this paper are useful strategies for reducing disorder.

Research suggests that increasing the fairness and clarity of school rules and the consistency of rule enforcement should reduce school disorder if the increased clarity and consistency are not at the expense of students' attachment to school. This is an important "if." Abee (1984) worked with three schools that focused on increasing clarity of rules and rule enforcement without specifically attending to students' attachment to school. In each case, classroom orderliness increased, but so did student alienation reports of punishment in school, and involvement in more serious kinds of delinquent behavior. Students' attachment to school dropped precipitously as did their reports of respectful treatment of students and fairness of school rules. Teachers in these schools were trained to use Canter's Assertive Discipline techniques, and implemented the method in apparently typical ways. The result was the same in each school: Teachers loved it; students hated it.

Fortunately, we have several demonstrations that rule clarity and consistent rule enforcement can be increased without alienating students. The Effective Schools Project described above is one such example. Recall that, in this field experiment, Assertive Discipline was augmented with an intensive

positive reinforcement program and with classroom meetings designed to increase attachment to teachers and other students. This strategy appears to have increased classroom orderliness, decreased delinquent behavior, and decreased student alienation.

Another example comes from the School Action Effectiveness Study. Project PATHE (D. Gottfredson, 1984, 1985, 1986b) was a comprehensive school improvement program that combined an organizational change approach with direct intervention for high-risk individuals to reduce school disorder. Program implementers used the PDE method described above to strengthen their program design and manage the implementation of their program in seven Charleston, South Carolina, schools. The program was multi-faceted. It used a team approach to involve school staff, parents, and students in the school change process. It used data to identify each school's problems and targeted interventions at the problem areas. It implemented schoolwide academic interventions (e.g., study-skills and test-taking programs) as well as school climate interventions (e.g., school pride campaigns and expanded extracurricular activities). It provided career-oriented services (job-seeking skills programs to the high school students and career exploration experiences to the middle-school students). And it provided intensive counseling and tutoring for students at high risk of dropping out

and becoming delinquent. Embedded in this array of school improvement strategies were specific interventions aimed at increasing fairness and clarity of rules and consistent rule enforcement. School rules were developed and posted in every school. Classroom rules were developed and posted in every classroom. Students participated in the development of the rules. A standard discipline referral form and a standard procedure were put in place whereby certain infractions would be handled by the school administration and other infractions by a PATHE specialist.

The evaluation showed that the program succeeded at reducing school disorder. The PATHE schools, taken as a group, improved on 85% of the seven measures of school disorder, while one comparison school improved on 60% and the other on only 28% of the measures. Increases in orderliness for six of the seven program schools reached conventional levels of statistical significance. Measures of intermediate outcomes showed that all PATHE schools improved on measures of Rule Fairness while the control schools declined. Most striking were the improvements on measures of School Attachment. Students in every PATHE school grew more attached to school, and the difference was statistically significant in three. Students in both comparison schools grew significantly less attached to school during the same period.

Instructional Strategies

Academic failure in school is another risk factor for delinquent behavior. Hence, it makes good sense to alter instructional strategies to increase commitment to school and reduce disruptive behavior. Examples from the School Action Effectiveness Study are helpful for pinpointing the effect of interventions designed to increase learning. Three of the seventeen models included components aimed at reducing failure experiences among high-risk individuals.

The first was a "pull-out" program that offered counseling and tutoring to students identified as at-risk for academic failure. A second was a year-long alternative English and social studies class that used innovative teaching strategies. The third was an alternative school that drew students who were not succeeding in the public school system into a small, orderly environment featuring individualized instruction and a token economy system. All three increased academic learning, but only one decreased delinquent behavior. A summary of evaluation results will follow the description of the three models.

The first model was the direct service component of project PATHE, described above. Approximately ten percent of the students in each school were identified on the basis of school

records and teacher referrals as in need of special services for either academic or conduct problems, or both. Specialists reviewed each target student's school records, interviewed the student and sometimes his or her teachers and parents, and developed treatment plans specifying behavioral treatment objectives. Academic and counseling services consistent with these objectives were prescribed, and progress towards the objectives was frequently monitored. Students were scheduled to meet with program specialists about three times a month to receive tutoring and counseling services, and they were deliberately included in school-wide project activities such as the student leadership team and extracurricular activities. Implementation records showed that the actual contact with specialists varied from school to school. In one school the average target student met with the specialist only 7.5 times during the 1982-83 year, in another about 33 times. The average across all schools was about twice per month.

The second program (Gottfredson & Cook, 1986) altered the curriculum and teaching strategies in alternative English and social studies classes to increase commitment to school by making school more relevant to students. The curriculum was highly structured, including lessons on coping with authority, responsibility, and family problems. Teachers relied heavily on

nontraditional teaching methods to promote student participation. Audio-visual presentations, field trips, guest speakers, role-playing, and simulations were frequently used.

The scheduling of the classes was novel. A two-hour block was set aside for combined English and social studies instruction. This extended-time block enabled field work activities, community volunteer work, and class trips.

The class was taught by a team of teachers and aides who were trained to use heterogeneous student learning teams for tutoring and support, individualized learning plans, and frequent rewards both for group and individual progress.

The third program model (Gottfredson, 1986a) was a small alternative school--only about 100 students were enrolled in the school at any one time. The academic component of the program focused on basic skills acquisition. Students were placed in an intensive basic skills class until they mastered basic skills. Participation in desirable elective courses and in the prestigious "professional/vocational track" were made contingent upon mastering basic skills. Standards in the academic classes were high. Students were expected to be able to meet the graduation requirements for the county upon completion of grade twelve in the alternative school.

The professional/vocational track consisted of highly structured apprenticeship experiences in community businesses. Eligible students spent as much as half of their day in career training classes and in volunteer work. Those students placed in apprenticeship positions were held to high performance standards: Supervisors rated the students daily and communicated the ratings to school counselors. Students kept daily logs of their work experiences.

Discipline was managed with a token economy system. Students earned tokens for meeting agreed-upon behavior and academic objectives. The tokens were exchanged for material goods.

As indicated above, all three programs were successful at increasing academic performance for the participating students. Program participants, when compared with comparable control students, learned more academic material. The measures of academic performance varied from project to project. Credits earned, persistence in school, attendance, grades, and standardized achievement test scores were affected. Only the alternative English and social studies class reduced the delinquent behavior of the participating students.

The PATHE "pull-out" program appears to have been too weak and not sufficiently focused on theoretical risk factors for disruptive behavior to have been expected to reduce disruptive behavior (D. Gottfredson, 1984). Although the design called for equal emphasis on academics and "affective needs," most of what occurred was tutoring. The alternative school was intensive, but it suffered from over-control. Students' behavior was under control in the school and they learned more. The atmosphere was always calm and orderly. But the controlled atmosphere was gained at the expense of students' attachment to school. The students in the alternative school became significantly less attached to school, and their level of delinquent behavior increased. The atmosphere appears to have been overly controlled, offering few opportunities for youths to develop attachments to prosocial others.

The alternative English and social studies class intervention was at the same time intensive and comprehensive. It increased student participation not only in activities aimed at increasing academic success, but also at broadening the base of social control. Students were actively involved not only in their own education but also in their schools and communities. These students became more committed to and attached to school, and reported higher levels of involvement in school activities. Their delinquent behavior declined significantly.

Current Research

The results summarized in this paper imply that organizational development in schools increases the likelihood of strong implementation of new practices and that specific strategies targeted at risk factors implied by research are effective for reducing school disorder. Among the research questions that remain are: (a) What are the essential features of effective organizational development in schools; (b) how can OD methods be institutionalized in schools; and (c) what specific strategies are most effective for reducing school disorder? A current project of the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools seeks to answer the third question; this project will test two strategies for reducing disruptive school behavior: A behavior-management system will incorporate elements to a) increase school and classroom rule clarity and consistency of rule enforcement, b) increase effective use by teachers and administrators of positive reinforcement, and c) increase parental reinforcement of appropriate student behavior in school by providing timely and consistent home notification of student behavior and by helping parents to use the information to reward appropriate behavior and punish inappropriate behavior. An academic remediation system will offer incentives to students and teachers to provide corrective instruction to students

falling behind in their work. These interventions will be implemented using the PDE method described earlier. The objective in this research is to learn more about how educators can increase rule fairness and consistency without increasing student alienation. While previous research has demonstrated that it is possible to achieve both ends, it has not identified which components of the multi-faceted programs actually brought about the desired results. The current research attempts to replicate the desired outcomes using a more carefully structured set of interventions.

Recommendations for Future Research

We need additional research on the process of school improvement and on specific strategies for increasing order in schools. Research on organizational development in schools is in its infancy. Scattered trials have shown that organizational development strategies can work, but we know next to nothing about specific organizational development methods. We need to analyze existing methods, determine major components of the methods, and begin the process of refining these tools. This process will involve evaluating specific components of OD methods and determining which components are effective in which kinds of schools. For example, schools with strong missions and clear goals may not benefit substantially from efforts to identify

problems and clarify goals. These schools benefit more from information about effective practices and assistance in planning for adaptation of those practices to their specific environments. Schools at the other extreme may benefit most from OD efforts that focus on creating a culture conducive to improvement and accomplishing one or two relatively simple but highly visible activities aimed at increasing morale before any more technological innovations are attempted.

We must also learn more about how schools can develop the capacity to sustain their own OD programs. It is likely that schools require an apprenticeship period during which they work closely with consultants skilled in OD methods. We need to learn about the characteristics of the apprenticeship period: What specific skills must the trainer have? What should be the duration and intensity of the apprenticeship?

The final set of research questions has to do with specific strategies for reducing school disorder and disruptive behavior. As Emmer (1986) showed, we have little evidence of effectiveness for even the most widely used and readily available strategies for improving student behavior. This is not to say that the popular methods are necessarily ineffective, but that rigorous evaluations of them are lacking. We do not know whether or not they are effective. We need to evaluate existing discipline

packages and to use our knowledge about the causes of disruptive behavior to develop and evaluate more theory-based programs.

References

Abee, F. A. (1984). School Enhancement Project: First interim report. Columbia, SC: The South Carolina Association of School Administrators (SCASA) and The Governor's Office, Division of Public Safety Programs.

Bahner, J. M. (1980). Testimony at the oversight hearing on American secondary education. In Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change: Vol. 8. Implementing and sustaining innovations (R-1589/8-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Boyer, E. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Canter, L., & Canter M. (1976). Assertive Discipline. Los Angeles, CA: Lee Canter & Associates, Inc.

Corcoran, T. B. (1985). Effective secondary schools. In R. M. J. Kyle (Ed.), Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cusick, P. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Emmer, E. T. (1986). Effects of teacher training in disciplinary approaches. Paper prepared for OERI's Conference on Student Discipline Strategies Analysis, Washington, DC, November 6-7.

Empey, L. T. (1982). American delinquency: Its meaning and construction (rev. ed.). Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Fullan, M., Miles, M. B., & Taylor, G. (1980). Organization development in schools: The state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 50, 121-183.

Gallup, G. H. (1974). Sixth annual Gallup poll of the public attitudes toward education. Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 20-32.

Gallup, G. H. (1984). The 16th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 23-38.

Glasser, W. (1969). Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1984). Implementing a theory in a large-scale educational intervention (Report No. 351). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1985). Project PATHE: A school-based model for primary prevention of adolescent drug use. In Drug abuse, mental health, and delinquency. (Summary) Proceedings of Practitioners' Conference on Juvenile Offenders with Serious Drug, Alcohol, and Mental Health Problems. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1986a). Academy for Community Education: Final Report. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1986b). An assessment of a delinquency prevention demonstration with both individual and environmental interventions (Report No. 361). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1986c). Creating effective urban public schools through researcher-practitioner collaboration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1986d). Increasing orderliness in urban public schools through organizational change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, November.

Gottfredson, D. C., & Cook, M. S. (1986). Increasing school relevance and student decisionmaking: Effective strategies for reducing delinquency? Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Gottfredson, G. D. (1981). Schooling and delinquency. In S. E. Martin, L. B. Sechrest, & R. Redner (Eds.), New directions in the rehabilitation of criminal offenders. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Gottfredson, G. D. (Ed.). (1982). The school action effectiveness study: First interim report (Report No. 325). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 835)

Gottfredson, G. D. (1984). A theory-ridden approach to program evaluation: A method for stimulating researcher-implementer collaboration. American Psychologist, 39, 1101-1112.

Gottfredson, G. D. (1985). Effective School Battery: User's manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (1985). Victimization in schools. New York: Plenum.

Gottfredson, G. D., Gottfredson, D. C., & Cook, M. S. (Eds.). (1983). The School Action Effectiveness Study: Second interim report (Report No. 342). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools. (ERIC No. ED 237 892)

Gottfredson, G. D., Rickert, D. E., Gottfredson, D. C., & Advani, N. (1984). Standards for Program Development Evaluation plans. Psychological Documents, 14, 32. (Ms. No. 2668)

Grant, J., & Capell, F. (1983). Reducing school crime: A report on the school team approach. San Rafael, CA: Social Action Research Center.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. (1977). A development model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14, 263-276.

Hawkins, J. D., Doueck, H., & Lishner, D. M. (1985). Changing teaching practices in mainstream classrooms to reduce discipline problems among low achievers. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for Social Welfare Research, School of Social Work.

Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Johnson, G., Bird, T., & Little, J. (1979). Delinquency prevention: Theories and strategies. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Klausmeier, H. J. (1985). Developing and institutionalizing a self-improvement capability: Structures and strategies of secondary schools. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Miles, M. B. (1981). Mapping the common properties of schools. In R. Lehming & M. Kane (Eds.), Improving schools: Using what we know (pp. 42-114). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform (A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education. (ERIC No. ED 226 006).

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1980). Program announcement: Delinquency prevention through alternative education. Washington, DC: OJJDP.

Sarason, S. B. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Slavin, R. E. (1980). Using Student Team Learning (rev. ed). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins Team Learning Project.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 673-676.